UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|----------------------|--|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/671,785 | 09/29/2003 Atsushi Date | | 03500.017602. | 7534 |
| 5514 FITZPATRICI | 7590 09/06/2007 K CELLA HARPER & SC | EXAMINER | | |
| 30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA | | | HUISMAN, DAVID J | |
| NEW YORK, NY 10112 | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | 2183 | |
| | | | | |
| | | | MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
| | | | 09/06/2007 | PAPER |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.



Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

| Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
|------------------|---------------|--|
| 10/671,785 | DATE, ATSUSHI | |
| Examiner | Art Unit | |
| David J. Huisman | 2183 | |

| | David J. Huisman | 2183 | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appe | ars on the cover sheet with the c | orrespondence add | ress | | | | | |
| THE REPLY FILED 24 August 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. | | | | | | | | |
| 1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or or this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Not a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliant time periods: | wing replies: (1) an amendment, aff stice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in c | idavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C | nce, which FR 41.31; or (3) | | | | | |
| a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date | e of the final rejection. | | | | | | | |
| b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. | | | | | | | | |
| Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f). | | | | | | | | |
| Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ex under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL | tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply orig r than three months after the mailing da | of the fee. The approprinally set in the final Offi | iate extension fee ce action; or (2) as | | | | | |
| The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exte a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed AMENDMENTS | nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to | avoid dismissal of th | | | | | | |
| 3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, | but prior to the date of filing a brief | will not be entered by | ecalise ' | | | | | |
| (a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further co (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo | nsideration and/or search (see NO | | odddod | | | | | |
| (c) They are not deemed to place the application in be appeal; and/or | • • | ducing or simplifying | the issues for | | | | | |
| (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)). | · - | ected claims. | | | | | | |
| 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s) | | mpliant Amendment | (PTOL-324). | | | | | |
| 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a non-allowable claim(s). | | timely filed amendme | ent canceling the | | | | | |
| 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: | | ll be entered and an e | explanation of | | | | | |
| Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: | | | | | | | | |
| Claim(s) rejected: 1-4 and 7-9 and set forth in the final re | <u>iection</u> . | | | | | | | |
| Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: | | | | | | | | |
| AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE | | | | | | | | |
| The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). | | | | | | | | |
| 9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar | overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appe | al and/or appellant fai | Is to provide a | | | | | |
| The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanatio REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER | n of the status of the claims after e | ntry is below or attach | ned. | | | | | |
| The request for reconsideration has been considered by see attached sheet. | , | n condition for allowar | nce because: | | | | | |
| 12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).13. ☐ Other: | (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |

David J. Huisman August 29, 2007 David Am

Applicant argues, on page 6 of the after-final remarks, in substance that:

"...However, Booker is not seen to disclose or suggest that EXCPU 14 and EMCPU 26 connect to a same bus, much less that EXCPU 14 and EMCPU 26 use such a same bus exclusively."

While fully considered, this argument is deemed non-persuasive by the examiner because Booker explains in column 6, lines 1-4, that after the memory operation is complete, EXCPU14 tri-states the memory interface. As is known in the art, tri-state, or 3-state logic, allows output ports to have a value of 0, 1, or Z. A 'Z' output stands for the output port being disconnected from the rest of the circuit, putting the output in a high impedance state. The intent of this state is to allow multiple circuits to share the same output line or bus without affecting each other. Tri-state logic devices are used to accommodate multiple bus drivers. If the outputs of several tri-state logic are electrically connected together, only one three-state logic device may be active. The other three-state logic devices may be in the high impedance mode and thus will not affect the output of the active three-state logic device.

Hence, the tri-stating implies that the multiple compoents share a bus, because the tri-state logic ensures that only one component drives the bus at a time.

In addition, applicant has changed the scope of the independent claim by no longer requiring that a component be reset but that a bus request be suppressed. This amendment would affect the examiner's current interpretation and rejection of the claims. Therefore, this amendment will not be entered as further search and consideration would be required.